DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 472 558 TM 034 577

AUTHOR	Niemeyer, Judith A.; Scott-Little, Catherine; Hussey, Susan
TITLE	Kindergarten Readiness Assessment Process: Perceptions of Parents, Teachers, and Administrators.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2002-04-00
NOTE	31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Education Research Association (April 5, 2002, New Orleans, LA).
CONTRACT	ED-01-CO-0015
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; Elementary School Teachers; Kindergarten; *Kindergarten Children; *Parents; Reading Readiness Tests; *School Readiness; Screening Tests; *Student Evaluation; Surveys

ABSTRACT

Kindergarten readiness assessment is considered important for identifying and facilitating successful school experiences for young children. However, little is known about the assessment process schools are using. The purpose of this study was to examine teachers', parents', and administrators' perceptions of the kindergarten readiness assessment process. A questionnaire was mailed to administrators, teachers, and parents in four states. Responses were received from 30 administrators, 81 teachers, and 85 parents, and followup telephone interviews were conducted with 7 administrators, 10 teachers, and 17 parents. Results indicate that parents have been minimally involved in the assessment process and have little knowledge of what it entails. In addition, it is apparent that most school districts have developed their own instruments for conducting kindergarten readiness assessment with great variability in timing related to assessment administration. Implications of these results are discussed in relation to young children's success in kindergarten. (Contains 8 tables and 21 references.) (Author/SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 472 558

Running head: KINDERGARTEN READINESS ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Kindergarten Readiness Assessment Process:

Perceptions of Parents, Teachers, and Administrators

Judith A Niemeyer

University of North Carolina Greensboro

Catherine Scott-Little

The Regional Educational Laboratory at SERVE

Susan Hussey

University of North Carolina Greensboro

Paper Presented at American Education Research Association (AERA)

Annual Conference, April 5, 2002, New Orleans, LA.

This research was funded through the U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) contract number ED-01-CO-0015 to the Regional Educational Laboratory at SERVE. Please do not cite or quote this paper without permission from Dr. Judith Niemeyer (336-334-3447)

TM034577

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J.A. Niemeyer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Kindergarten readiness assessment is considered important for identifying and facilitating successful school experiences for young children. However, little is known about the assessment process schools are using. The purpose of this study was to examine teachers', parents', and administrators' perceptions of the kindergarten readiness assessment process. Results indicated that parents have been minimally involved in the assessment process and have little knowledge of what it entails. Additionally, most school districts have developed their own instruments for conducting kindergarten readiness assessment with great variability in timing related to assessment administration. Implications of these results are discussed related to young children's success in kindergarten.

Kindergarten Readiness Assessment Process:

Perceptions of Parents, Teachers, and Administrators

The nation's first education goal as outlined by the National Education Goals Panel (NEGP) in 1991 projected that by the year 2000 all children will start school "ready to learn." As expected, this generated intense debate around the subject of what it means to be "ready" for school. Although the majority of states have determined a child's eligibility for kindergarten by his/her age (Education Commission of the States, 2000), children enter kindergarten with a wide variety of skills and abilities (West, Denton, & Germino-Hausken, 2000; West, Denton, & Reaney, 2000; Zill & West, 2000). The demand for standard methods to document children's skills and abilities when they enter kindergarten has become increasingly strong, in spite of the inherent measurement difficulties in assessing children of this age (Shepard, Kagan, & Wurtz, 1998).

Previous research indicates that state kindergarten entry assessment policies have shifted over time. In the mid-1980's many states were implementing standardized assessment systems generally considered inappropriate for children of kindergarten age (Gnezda & Bolig, 1988). The trend was for states to conduct assessments to determine children's level of preparedness for school and then to make child placement decisions based on these assessments. In the mid-1990's states had shifted away from readiness assessments, with policies against the use of readiness testing (Shepard, Taylor, & Kagan, 1996). The latest survey of states (Saluja, Scott-Little, & Clifford, 2000) indicated yet another swing toward assessment of children when they enter kindergarten, with 13 states reporting in late 1999 that they conduct statewide screening or assessments when children enter kindergarten. Five additional states required statewide screenings or assessments

but left it up to local school districts to decide how to conduct them. About half the states (n = 26) reported that they do not require readiness assessments but local districts can, and do, choose to assess children when they enter kindergarten. Sixteen states reported that they currently had assessment initiatives underway, with Task Forces studying the issue or developing a plan for assessing children when they enter kindergarten.

Kindergarten assessments can be a useful tool for teachers and schools. According to Emig (2000), assessments are valuable resources for determining the skills of individual children and, when used properly, are an effective tool for designing and delivering appropriate services for children. The NEGP identified four purposes for assessing children when they enter kindergarten including the following: identification of pre-existing skills of children and the needs of each child, identification of children who need additional services, monitoring trends in children's preparedness for school and evaluations of services, and to determine the academic progress of children for better accountability (Emig, 2000). Also, the NGEP stressed that assessments should be age and linguistically appropriate, should only be used in the way in which they were intended, should be valid and reliable, and should obtain information from multiple sources (i.e., from parents and teachers as well as from the children). Kindergarten assessments that meet these criteria can provide useful and valid information for teachers, as well as the programs serving children.

In addition to the information collected through assessments, the assessment process itself may be beneficial. Dever and Barta (2001) used open-ended focus groups to determine how teachers, administrators, and parents viewed an assessment process the state of Utah had put into place to collect standardized information on kindergarten

children's emerging early reading and numerousy skills. Respondents indicated that the assessment process—a individually administered, on-demand assessment—provided parents, teachers, and children a chance to meet and talk a before school started and also helped to ease the child's transition to kindergarten. Setting the results of the assessment aside, the assessment process can be a chance to help children get off to a good start in kindergarten by giving them an opportunity for one-on-one contact with their new teacher.

It is important to note that there also may be negative consequences to kindergarten readiness assessments, especially when the assessments do not meet the standards or criteria for appropriate assessments outlined by the NEGP. Some possible negative consequences include narrowing of the areas included in the curriculum because teachers tend to teach skills and subject areas that are assessed; undue emphasis on the assessment process; ineffective use of the time required to conduct the assessment that could otherwise be used for instruction; and anxiety for teachers, parents, and children (Dever & Barta, 2001; Engel, 1991). Furthermore, kindergarten assessments may be used inappropriately to deny school entry. The American Academy of Pediatrics (1995) points out that teacher training is also essential to ensure that assessments are used properly. At best, inappropriate assessments waste a child's and teachers' time. At worst, these assessments may be used to delay children's enrollment in kindergarten.

In spite of the widespread use of kindergarten entry assessments and the apparent potential for both benefit and harm to children, relatively little is known about how kindergarten assessments are developed and used in schools. Costenbader, Rohrer, & Difonzo (2000) examined current practices of kindergarten readiness assessment in New

York State. They surveyed professionals in charge of kindergarten screening in each school district in New York and collected data on a) the types of assessments used; b) how assessments were conducted; and c) how much time was spent assessing each child. Costenbader, Rohrer & Difonzo (2000) found that approximately 30% of the school districts in New York use locally constructed assessments. Three commercially available assessments were used by more than ten percent of the responding schools districts: the DIAL-R, the Brigance K & 1 Screen, and the Gesell School Readiness Test. School districts using locally constructed instruments often reported that they had incorporated items from standardized assessments as part of their kindergarten assessment battery. Given the importance of using valid and reliable measures to assess children, the wide-scale use of locally designed instruments, which may or may not have documented reliability and validity, is especially problematic. On the positive side, most districts reported that the assessments conducted with kindergarten children were conducted on an individual basis and most reported that a variety of educational specialists (such as speech/language pathologists) were involved in the process. Unfortunately, when asked what typically happens when a child scores under the age expectation or is not able to perform certain skills deemed important for school success, almost 20% of the respondents indicated that parents are encouraged to leave their child in a preschool setting for one more year.

Clearly "school readiness" is a hot topic among early educators and policy makers across the country. More and more states and districts are implementing readiness assessment systems. Yet there is little information on how children are actually being assessed when they enter kindergarten. States are implementing policies and assessment

systems, but what are children actually experiencing when they enter school and how do parents and teachers view the process? These are significant questions for educators and policy makers interested in having credible data on children when they enter school.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to obtain information from teachers, parents and administrators about the assessment process used in their school when children enter kindergarten. In particular, the following questions were addressed: a) what are the logistical characteristics of the assessment process schools conduct when children enter kindergarten (e.g., what instruments are used, who conducts the assessments, when are assessments conducted)? b) how are parents involved in the assessment process?; c) do teachers and administrators feel that the instruments accurately document children's "readiness" for school?; d) how are results from the assessments communicated to parents? To teachers? To administrators?; e) how do teachers, administrators, and parents use the information from these assessments?; f) what strategies do practitioners suggest to improve the measures and/or uses of the assessment process? In an attempt to answer these questions, parents, teachers, and administrators from four states were surveyed and interviewed.

Method

Surveys were mailed and personal interviews conducted with teachers, administrators and parents in four states in the Southeast region of the United States. The surveys collected quantitative information about parents', teachers', and administrators' perceptions of the kindergarten readiness assessment process. To obtain more in-depth information about the assessment process, personal interviews were conducted with a select group of participants who volunteered to be interviewed.

Survey

A paper-and-pencil survey was piloted with a sample of administrators, kindergarten teachers, and parents of kindergarten children to determine the clarity of questions and ease of completing the survey. Based on their feedback, the final survey consisted of thirteen questions presented in a multiple choice format whereby participants were either asked to mark all answers that applied or mark only one response per answer. Each question provided additional space for participants to provide other information they felt was important in order to more accurately reflect their viewpoint regarding the kindergarten readiness assessment process.

The first question on the survey served to identify the role of the participants, whether parent, teacher, or administrator, and the second question asked which instrument(s) was used by the school to assess children upon entering kindergarten. The third question served to identify what the respondent believed to be the top three most important purposes for assessing kindergarten children. For the next eight questions, respondents were asked about the specific procedures for assessing kindergarten children such as where the assessment takes place, how it is administered and who administers it. In addition, questions were asked about: a) how information is collected from parents; b) when assessments are administered; c) how is information shared with parents, teachers, and administrators; d) how information collected is used; and e) where the information is kept. The remaining two questions asked respondents to acknowledge how satisfied they were with the information received regarding the assessment and how accurately they think the assessment reflects children's development. A section at the end of the survey

requested demographic information such as gender, race, education level, and information about the number of children with disabilities in the class.

Procedure

School systems in each of four states in the Southeast region of the United States were randomly selected to participate in the survey (North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia). Superintendents for three to five school systems in each state were contacted by telephone to request initial permission to conduct the study in their system. Then, a copy of the survey was faxed for their review. Once consent from the Superintendent's office was given, three to five elementary schools within the district were randomly selected and the school principal was called to solicit their participation in the study. Often, a copy of the survey was requested for the principal to preview prior to approval. Once the principal agreed, surveys were sent to the school and the principal was requested to distribute the surveys to all school administrators (defined as principals and assistant principals), all kindergarten teachers in the school, and all parents in the largest kindergarten classroom. The principals were asked to return all of the surveys from the school in one envelope within a week and when this did not happen, two to three follow-up telephone calls were made.

The survey packet each participant received included the survey, a cover letter explaining the purpose of the research study, and a voluntary consent form to participate in a follow-up telephone interview. A total of 640 surveys were mailed out, with 56 surveys being sent to administrators, 139 surveys being sent to kindergarten teachers, and 445 surveys being sent to parents of children in kindergarten.

. Telephone interviews were conducted with a sub-sample of survey respondents. The purposes for conducting the interviews were: a) to gather more in-depth information regarding the assessment process; b) to obtain the respondents' opinions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment; and c) to identify suggestions for improving the readiness assessment process. Respondents who returned the voluntary consent form indicating they were willing to participate in a phone interview were contacted and appointments scheduled for the interview. During the interview, a trained researcher asked a total of 10 questions about the assessment process used in their school and for suggestions on how the assessment process might be improved. A total of 53 respondents agreed to participate in the phone interviews, 8 administrators, 15 teachers, and 30 parents.

Participants

Responses were received from ten school districts and 25 individual schools, with an overall return rate of 30%. Of those respondents, 30 were administrators (53.5% response rate), 81 were teachers (58.2% response rate), and 85 were parents (19.1% response rate). Of the 53 respondents who agreed to participate in the follow-up telephone interviews, a total of 34 telephone interviews were conducted, with 7 administrators, 10 teachers, and 17 parents, positing a 64% response rate.

Results

Data from the surveys were scanned and analyzed using the SPSS data analysis program. Frequency charts were created for each question on the survey to determine responses from parents, teachers, and administrators. Results for survey questions related to the a) purpose of kindergarten readiness assessment, b) logistical characteristics, c)

level of parental involvement, d) level of satisfaction with the assessment instrument, e) mode of communicating results, f) use of results, are specifically discussed. Qualitative data analysis techniques were used to analyze responses from the phone interviews. Significant themes within the responses were identified and are discussed under the results section.

What is the purpose of kindergarten readiness assessment?

The most frequently occurring response for the most important purpose for kindergarten readiness assessment was identification of strengths and weaknesses of the children, with more administrators reporting this than teachers and more teachers reporting this than parents (See Table 1). The identification of strengths and weaknesses of children was also most frequently reported for the second most important purpose for assessment for administrators and parents, but teachers more often reported that the second most important purpose for assessments at kindergarten entry was the identification of children who are at risk or with disabilities. All three groups reported that identification of children who are at risk or with disabilities as the third most important purpose of assessment.

What are the logistical characteristics of the assessment processes schools conduct when children enter kindergarten?

The results listed in Tables 2 and 3 reflect the perceptions of parents, teachers, and administrators regarding the logistical characteristics of the assessment process. Assessment Used. The greatest percentage of teachers and administrators reported that their school used an assessment that was developed by their teachers and/or school system (See Table 2). Other frequently reported assessments include the Alabama Early Learning Inventory, the AGS Screening Profile, STEPS, and DIBELS.

Location. There was discrepancy among the parents, teachers and administrators responses in regard to the location of the assessments. For the most part, parents reported that they did not know where they typically took place (See Table 3). On the other hand, teachers responded that the assessments usually were administered in the classroom with other children present, while administrators noted that assessments usually took place in a large room with many assessors.

Method of Administration. The majority of parents, teachers, and administrators agreed that assessments were administered to individual children one at a time (See Table 3).

Assessment Administrator. Parents were more likely to report that assessments were administered by a person (other than the child's teacher) who is unfamiliar with the child while many teachers and administrators reported that assessments were administered by teachers who were unfamiliar with the child (See Table 3).

Time of Assessment. While some reported that assessments were administered within a few months of the beginning of the school year, the majority of parents, teachers, and administrators reported that assessments were usually administered three or more months prior to the children's entry into kindergarten (See Table 3).

How are parents involved in the assessment process?

When asked how parents were involved in the process of assessment, some parents, teachers, and administrators reported that they completed a checklist of skills about their children, while others mentioned that they participated in a personal interview with the assessor about their children (See Table 4). The majority of parents, teachers, and administrators, however, responded that parents were primarily involved in the

assessment process by completing a registration form that included background information about their children.

Do parents, teachers, and administrators feel that the instruments accurately document children's readiness levels?

Teachers, administrators and parents perceptions of the accuracy of assessment information are presented in Table 5. While there were varying beliefs about the accuracy of information provided by the assessment instruments used in the process, the majority of parents, teachers, and administrators responded that the information provided from various assessment instruments somewhat accurately reflected children's readiness levels.

How are the results from the assessments communicated to parents, teachers, and administrators?

The majority of parents reported that results of the assessment were shared with them through written reports. Teachers and administrators were more likely to report that information was shared with parents through individual meetings with them. While the majority of parents noted that they did not know how results were shared with teachers and administrators, the majority of teachers and administrators reported that assessment results were shared with each of them in written reports.

How do parents, teachers, and administrators use the data from the readiness assessment measures?

The majority of parents did not know how the assessment information was used (See Table 7) while teachers and administrators reported that the data from the readiness assessment was used to develop classroom activities. Administrators also felt the results were used to identify children who needed further assessment.

Interview Data

During the follow-up telephone interviews participants were questioned about the level of training provided for practitioners who administer the assessments as well as suggestions for improving the assessment process. From these interview responses, three major themes emerged. First, the majority of teacher and administrator respondents indicated either teachers received no training to conduct the assessments or that when training is provided, it basically consists of a short workshop of less than one day. Also, parents responded that they were unaware of any training provided to those who administered the assessments (See Table 8).

Another theme that emerged from the telephone interviews is that many respondents suggested schools should develop their own assessment instrument that address information teachers feel is important for kindergarten readiness. As one teacher reported, "If we had something short and sweet, things you really needed to know and look for. We've kind of made up our own – ABCs, counting, mom's last name, their last name, etc." An administrator stated, "Maybe ideally you would have teachers develop their own instrument." Another administrator reported that developing local assessments is necessary because "the [standardized] assessment offers no way to gauge child to child interactions/cooperation. You get little social/emotional information." Along with that, one parent reported that schools should make up their own tests and "not always base tests and results on children's intelligence, especially those at such a young age."

The third major theme that emerged from the interviews is that parents should be informed of the purpose of assessment and included in the assessment process. One parent reported that schools should "let parents know the goal of testing." Another parent

stated that schools should, "have parents more involved, maybe inform them more." In addition, many of the parents who suggested that they be more informed also mentioned that this could lead to greater parental involvement in the process of kindergarten readiness assessment. For example, one parent reported that schools should "include the parent at some point and give some follow-up suggestions for summer work in weak areas." This would, in turn, allow the parents to more actively participate in their children's learning.

Discussion

In examining teachers, parents and administrators perceptions of the kindergarten readiness assessment process, several findings are noteworthy. First, parents are at best, minimally involved in the assessment process and have little or no knowledge of the assessment process itself. Second, the majority of the school systems are currently using locally developed assessment instruments for use in determining kindergarten readiness. Third, logistically, the timing of the readiness assessment is variable from one school system to another.

Overall, parents mentioned that they either did not know what was included in the assessment process or minimally understood what was involved. While they often agreed with teachers and administrators on general questions related to the main purpose of assessment, when the assessment is administered, and who administers the assessment, for the most part, they did not know how it was administered or how the information was used. It is interesting to note that the type of parental involvement teachers, parents, and administrators mentioned most was that of filling out the registration form. While this might be considered a form of involvement, it is not integral to the assessment process

itself. Because this is the primary form of parent involvement identified by all three groups, is perhaps an explanation for why parents more often responded, "I don't know" to specific questions relating to the kindergarten readiness assessment process.

If parents were more involved in the assessment process, such as completing a developmental checklist, participating in an interview, or observing the assessment with opportunities for input, they might be more knowledgeable about specific issues regarding the process. Early childhood programs are placing a greater emphasis on family participation in all program aspects, including assessment, because parents are a major influence in their child's growth and development (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997). Likewise, Brantlinger (1991), Dunst, (1990), and Winton (1990) recognize parents as experts in regard to their own child's development and therefore, their involvement in the assessment process would be critical. When parents are actively involved in the assessment process and as such, considered experts on their child's development, the information gained will more accurately reflect the child's abilities, knowledge, and skills. From the current study, it is clear that parents appeared to know little about the kindergarten readiness assessment process that suggests they may not be actively involved in the process.

Another finding indicates that most of the school systems currently are using assessment instruments developed locally by individual school systems. While this may provide a good measure for identifying specifically the skills, abilities and knowledge for a particular school system's focus, there are limitations. In particular, issues related to generalization, reliability, and validity are especially important to consider. It is important to use instruments that have a proven track record, in other words, are reliable and valid,

otherwise it is difficult to have confidence in the information collected and to generalize conclusions (Scott-Little & Niemeyer, 2001).

On the other hand, locally developed instruments could provide a more authentic or naturalistic approach that is important in kindergarten assessment (Scott-Little & Niemeyer, 2001). Authentic assessment provides a familiar environment (e.g., teacher as examiner, classroom tasks, classroom environment) for the child to demonstrate their abilities and is optimum for providing a 'true' picture of the child. Furthermore, the purpose of the assessment plays a major role in determining the type of assessment instrument that should be used. Assessments conducted to screen children for suspected disabilities should have proven reliability and validity, while assessments conducted to give the teacher a chance to get to know the child or to provide information for curriculum development may not need the same high degree of reliability and validity.

Finally, there is great variability among school systems as to logistics and timing of the assessments. Results indicated that assessments are administered in a variety of situations, such as, individually by classroom teachers, unfamiliar individuals, and in some cases, large group situations. Young children respond in different ways to different assessment situations, especially if they are being assessed by a familiar individual, in a familiar situation vs. in a large setting with strange peers and adults. Therefore, assessment results may be skewed depending on the child's level of comfort during the assessment session. Furthermore, assessment administration differences among school systems will provide different types of information making it difficult to ascertain readiness assessment information for the children.

Likewise, some of the assessments are administered as early as three or more months prior to the start of kindergarten, while others are given during the first month after kindergarten begins. Young children develop rapidly during the early years so an assessment completed three or more months prior to kindergarten will yield different information than if the child is assessed during the first month of school. Again, the purpose of the assessment becomes a major consideration as to the timing of the assessment. Likewise, the school systems definition of 'ready' is another consideration. If the school is referring to the child's readiness, perhaps one might consider providing additional early experiences for the child so they can be 'ready' for school. However, the school system could be responsive to a child's early developmental years and identify ways in which they can be prepared or 'ready' for the child. Readiness has often been viewed as, 'children being ready for kindergarten' however many discussions are underway about the readiness of schools for children entering kindergarten (Meisels, 1999; Pianta & Cox, 1999). Because there is great variability among school systems as to when the assessment is actually administered, clarity of purpose for the assessment is very important.

Results from this study yielded important clues to issues related to the assessment process. However, additional research is needed to document key elements of how schools are assessing children when they enter kindergarten. For instance, additional research is needed to explore differences between parents', teachers', and administrators' perceptions by race, income, and educational experience of the respondent. Unfortunately, in the current study a large portion of the respondents did not complete the demographics section of the survey; therefore it is impossible to examine the results of

this study regarding gender, race, and educational background of the participants. While this information was clearly requested on the survey, it was included at the end of the survey. Participants may have felt that this information was unneeded or unimportant.

Further study is needed to document how parents are involved in the assessment process and how they feel they can contribute to the process. In the current study the response rate from the parents was relatively low. While we anticipated a low response rate, the parents who actually responded may have been those who knew the least about assessment, hence not providing us with an accurate picture of parental knowledge about the assessment process.

Conclusion

Based on the results of this study, it would be helpful if parents were more involved in the process of kindergarten readiness assessment. As such, they could become active participants and thereby, influence the outcome of the assessment so that it more accurately reflects the abilities of the children. In addition, school systems might want to consider using instruments that are standardized so that the information is generalizable. Finally, logistics and timing of the assessment should take into consideration the purpose of the assessment and the utilization of the results.

The ultimate goal for kindergarten readiness assessment is to provide the most optimum environment for learning, therefore the context of assessment is critical. Whether the school system is focusing on the child's 'readiness' for school or on the school being 'ready' for the child, the assessment process must be carefully planned and considered.

References

American Academy of Pediatrics (1995). The appropriate use of school readiness tests. *Pediatrics, 95* (3), 437-439.

Brantlinger, E. (1991). Home-school partnerships that benefit children with special needs. *The Elementary School Journal, 91*(3), 249-259.

Bredekamp, S. & Copple, C (1997). *Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs*, Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Costenbader, V., Rohrer, A., & Difonzo, N. (2000). Kindergarten screening: A survey of current practice. *Psychology in the Schools, 37* (4), 323-332.

Dever, M. T. & Barta, J. J. (2001). Standardized entrance assessment in kindergarten: A qualitative analysis of the experiences of teachers, administrators, and parents. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 15* (2), 220-233.

Dunst, C. (1990). Family support principles: Checklists for program builders and practitioners. *Family Systems Intervention Monograph, 2*, (5). Morganton, NC: Family, Infant, and Preschool Program, Western Carolina Center.

Education Commission of the States. (2000). *ECS Online*. Available: http://www.ecs.org/ [2000, May 15].

Emig, C. (Ed.). (2000). School readiness: Helping communities get children ready for school and schools ready for children. *Child Trends Research Brief.*

Engel, P. (1991). Tracking progress toward the school readiness goal. *Educational Leadership, 48* (5), 39-42.

Gnezda, M.T. & Bolig, R. (1988). *A national survey of public school testing of prekindergarten and kindergarten children.* Paper prepared for the National Forum on the Future of Children and Families and the National Association of State Boards of Education.

Meisels, S. J. (1999). Assessing readiness. In R. C. Pianta, & M. J. Cox (Eds.), *The transition to kindergarten*, (pp. 39-66). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

National Education Goals Panel. (1991). *The goal 1 technical planning subgroup report on school readiness*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Pianta, R. C., & Cox, M. J. (1999). *The Transition to Kindergarten*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Saluja, G., Scott-Little, C., & Clifford, R.M. (2000). Readiness for school: A survey of state policies and definitions. *Early Childhood Research & Practice. 2* (2). Available: http://www.ecrp.uiuc.edu/v2n2/saljua.htm. [2001, July 24].

Scott-Little, C. & Niemeyer, J. (2001). *Assessing kindergarten children: What school systems need to know*. Greensboro, NC: SERVE Publications.

Shepard, L., Kagan, S.L., & Wurtz, E. (Eds.). (1998). *Principles and recommendations for early childhood assessments.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Goals Panel. ED416 033.

Shepard, L. Taylor, G.A., & Kagan, S.L. (1996) *Trends in early childhood assessment policies and practices*. Report prepared for the National Education Goals Panel. Washington, D.C.: National Education Goals Panel.

West, J., Denton, K., & Germino-Hausken, E. (2000). *America's kindergarteners*.

Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. (NCES 2000070)

West, J., Denton, K., & Reaney, L. (2000). *The kindergarten year*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. (NCES 20001023).

Winton, P. (1990). *Working with families in early intervention: An interdisciplinary preservice curriculum*, 2nd edition. Chapel Hill, NC: Carolina Institute for Research on Infant Personnel Development, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, UNC-CH.

Zill, N. & West, J. (2000). Entering kindergarten: A portrait of American children when they begin school. *The condition of education 2000*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. (NCES 2000062).

Table 1.

Perceptions of purpose for kindergarten readiness assessment.

Question	Parent (%)	Teacher (%)	Administrator (%)
Most Important Purpose for K Assessment			
Screening for Kindergarten Entry	21.2	8.6	13.3
ID children's strengths & weaknesses	32.9	44.4	56.7
Class placement	4.7	1.2	0
ID children at-risk or with disabilities	12.9	25.9	23.3
Evaluation of preschool/K programs	3.5	0	0
Determine focus of classroom activities	7.1	9.9	6.7
I don't know	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
2nd Most Important Purpose for K Assessment			
Screening for Kindergarten Entry	5.9	14.8	6.7
ID children's strengths & weaknesses	28.2	19.8	30.0
Class placement	10.6	4.9	13.3
ID children at-risk or with disabilities	14.1	23.5	26.7
Evaluation of preschool/K programs	3.5	2.5	0
Determine focus of classroom activities	3.5	14.8	16.7
I don't know	0	1.2	0
Other	0	0	0
3rd Most Important Purpose for K Assessment			
Screening for Kindergarten Entry	3.5	11.1	10.0
ID children's strengths & weaknesses	7.1	11.1	6.7
Class placement	17.6	12.3	6.7
ID children at-risk or with disabilities	17.6	19.8	33.3
Evaluation of preschool/K programs	3.5	6.2	13.3
Determine focus of classroom activities	16.5	17.3	23.3
I don't know	0	0	0
Other	0	1.2	0

Table 2.

Data on instruments currently used by school systems surveyed.

Instrument	%
Teacher/school designed test	19.8
Alabama Early Inventory	17.1
STEPS	13.5
AGS	12.6
DIBELS	10.8
Language for Learning	4.5
G-KAP	3.6
Wings	2.7
Not Sure	2.7
Early Screening Inventory (Revised)	1.8
None	1.8
Basic Literacy Test	0.9
Brigance	0.9
Dial R	0.9
EPSF	0.9
K-1 Screen	0.9
NC K-2 Assessment	0.9
Portfolio	0.9
Saxon Phonemic Awareness	0.9
Stanine 9	0.9
State Assessment	0.9

Table 3.

Perceptions of logistical characteristics of the kindergarten readiness assessment process.

Question	Parent (%)	Teacher (%)	Administrator (%)
Location of assessment			
Classroom with other children	22.4	34.6	23.3
Small room unfamiliar to child	12.9	9.9	23.3
Small room familiar to child	7.1	9.9	13.3
Large room with many assessors	17.6	28.4	26.7
I don't know	31.8	0	0
Other	5.9	9.9	13.3
Method of administration			
Individually, one at a time	49.4	95.1	90.0
In small groups (3-4 at a time)	7.1	1.2	3.3
Large groups (4+ at a time)	4.7	0	0
Checklist of informal observations	0	1.2	0
Portfolio (collection of child's work)	2.4	1.2	3.3
I don't know	35.3	0	0
Other	0	0	3.3
Administrator of assessment			
Teacher familiar with child	32.9	44.4	43.3
Person unfamiliar with child	35.3	42.0	36.7
I don't know	23.5	0	0
Other	4.7	12.3	16.7
When is assessment administered?			
Three or more months prior to K	36.5	42.0	53.3
Few than 4 weeks prior to K	18.8	3.7	0
First day of school	3.5	2.5	0
First week after beginning of school	10.6	4.9	10.0
First month after beginning of school	10.6	39.5	26.7
I don't know	15.3	0	0
Other	1.2	3.7	6.7
Where is information from assessment kept?			
Given to parents	18.8	33.3	16.7
Kept in child's school records	41.2	70.4	76.7
Kept in teacher's classroom records	16.5	51.9	53.3
I don't know	54.1	2.5	0
Other	1.2	2.5	6.7

Table 4.

How are parents involved in the process of kindergarten readiness assessment?

Question	Parent (%)	Teacher (%)	Administrator (%)
How is information collected from parents?			
Checklist of skills	24.7	23.5	50.0
Personal interview	16.5	24.7	26.7
Registration form	47.1	71.6	66.7
I don't know	16.5	2.5	0
Other	7.1	1.2	0

Table 5.

Perceptions of the accuracy of the information obtained from assessment.

Question	Parent (%)	Teacher (%)	Administrator (%)
How satisfied are you with the information provided?			
Very Satisfied	11.8	11.1	23.3
Satisfied	49.4	65.4	60.0
Somewhat Dissatisfied	14.1	18.5	13.3
Dissatisfied	17.6	2.5	3.3
How does information reflect child's development?			
Very accurately	20.0	23.5	40.0
Somewhat accurately	51.8	60.5	53.3
Somewhat inaccurately	4.7	12.3	0
Not at all accurate	1.2	2.5	0

Table 6.

Perceptions of how information from assessment is communicated to parents, teachers, and administrators.

Question	Parent (%)	Teacher (%)	Administrator (%)
How is information from assessment shared?			
With parents			
Written report	31.8	40.7	30.0
Individual meeting	27.1	43.2	53.3
Group meeting	7.1	3.7	6.7
Informally after assessment	20.0	28.4	36.7
Not shared	17.6	6.2	3.3
I don't know	10.6	0	3.3
Other	1.2	3.7	0
With teachers			
Written report	16.5	50.6	70.0
Individual meeting	11.8	16.0	20.0
Group meeting	4.7	18.5	20.0
Informally after assessment	8.2	21.0	20.0
Not shared	2.4	8.6	0
I don't know	32.9	1.2	0
Other	2.4	3.7	3.3
With administrators			
Written report	10.6	39.5	63.3
Individual meeting	4.7	9.9	10.0
Group meeting	7.1	9.9	6.7
Informally after assessment	4.7	14.8	10.0
Not shared	1.2	12.3	10.0
I don't know	34.1	4.9	3.3
Other	0	2.5	10.0

Table 7.

Perceptions of how information from assessment is used.

Question	Parent (%)	Teacher (%)	Administrator (%)
How is information from assessment used?			
Class placement	14.1	19.8	23.3
ID children for further assessment	21.2	23.5	30.0
Determine IEP goals	3.5	6.2	0
Develop classroom activities	2.4	40.7	30.0
I don't know	49.4	1.2	0
Other	1.2	4.9	3.3

Table 8.

Data from telephone interviews on level of training provided for administration of the assessment.

Question	Parent (%)	Teacher (%)	Administrator (%)
Training provided for assessment process			
Short workshop (less than 1 day)	0	40.0	42.8
Moderate training (1-3 days)	0	10.0	28.5
Extensive training (4+ days)	0	20.0	0
No formal training – experience only	0	30.0	28.5
I don't know	100.0	0	0

TM034577

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

AERA

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:
Kindergarten Readiness Assessment Process

Author(s): Judith A. Niemeyer, Catherine Scott-Little, Susan Hussey

Corporate Source:
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Publication Date:
under review

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☐

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☒

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Judith A Niemeyer	Printed Name/Position/Title: Judith A Niemeyer Associate Professor
Organization/Address: University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 301A Curry, P.O. Box 26171, Greensboro, NC 27402-6171	Telephone: 336-334-3497 FAX: 256-0185
	E-Mail Address: janiemey@uncg.edu Date: 4-5-2002

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)